

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-5, and 11-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3-5, and 11-13 are amended and claims 6-10, and 15 are canceled. No new matter is added.

**I. Allowable Claims**

Applicants appreciate the Office Action's indication that claims 3 and 11-12 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

**II. Claim Rejections Under 37 C.F.R. §1.75**

The Office Action objects to claim 5 under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c) alleging claim 5 does not further limit claim 1.

By this Amendment, claim 5 is amended to be independent, rendering the objection moot. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

**III. Claim Rejection Based on Matsui**

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 4, 6-8, 10, and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,330,039 to Matsui et al. (Matsui). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

By this Amendment, claims 6-8, 10, and 15 are canceled. Thus, the rejection as to these claims is moot.

By this Amendment, independent claims 1 and 13 are amended to recite a plurality of light sources, each having a plurality of light-emitting devices, each light-emitting device in one light source having a different emission spectra and being capable of independently adjusting its output, at least one light modulation device that modulates the primary color light components, an image analysis device that produces a light control signal, and a light controlling device that adjusts the emission spectra of the primary light components based on a control signal from the image analysis device.

Matsui discloses a controller 35, light-emitting diodes 12R-12B, picture display light valves 11R-11B, and a picture signal processing circuit 31 (Fig. 3). Matsui additionally discloses field lenses 14R-14B and synthesis prism 10 (Fig. 2). In another embodiment, light sources 42 can each have plural light-emitting diodes (Figs. 8-9). In this embodiment, all the diodes of one light source 42 have the same emission spectra (col. 11, line 56 to col. 12, line 8). Applicants understand that the Office Action alleges that the picture display light valves 11R-11B correspond to the claimed at least one light modulation device.

Thus, regarding independent claim 1, Matsui fails to disclose (1) a plurality of light sources, each having a plurality of light-emitting devices, each light-emitting device in one light source having a different emission spectra and being capable of independently adjusting its output; and (2) a light controlling device that adjusts the emission spectra of the primary color light components based on a light control signal output by an image analysis device. Regarding feature (2), as can be seen in Matsui's Fig. 3, the picture signal processing circuit 31 does not control any of the LED driving circuits 31R-34B.

Similarly, regarding independent claim 13, Matsui fails to disclose (1) a plurality of light sources, each having a plurality of light-emitting devices, each light-emitting device in one light source having a different emission spectra and being capable of independently adjusting its output; and (2) adjusting by a light controlling device the emission spectra of the primary color light components based on a light control signal output by an image analysis device.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

#### **IV. Claim Rejections Based on Allen**

The Office Action (i) rejects claims 1-2, 9, and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0227577 to Allen et al. (Allen) and (ii) rejects claim 4

under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Allen in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,882,379 to Yokoyama et al. (Yokoyama). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Allen discloses a system 110 that includes light sources 124, 126, and 128 that can be of different colors (paragraph [0045]), can include filters (paragraph [0051]) and can each be an array of lights (paragraph [0045]). The emitted light is reflected through a spatial light modulator 148. The Office Action alleges that gamut selection device 120, in combination with projector system controller 114, can control the emission spectra of the light sources 124, 126, and 128. However, Allen only discloses that the display gamut can be controlled by increasing or decreasing the relative levels of the light sources 124, 126, and 128, whereby altering the sequence of the light sources 124, 126, and 128 (paragraph [0051]). Additionally, Allen discloses that projector system controller 114 only controls the sequence of the light sources 124, 126, or 128 (paragraph [0050]).

Thus, regarding independent claims 1 and 13, Allen fails to disclose (1) a plurality of light sources, each having a plurality of light-emitting devices; and (2) each light-emitting device of each light source having a different emission spectra and being capable of independently adjusting its output. Further, the Office Action fails to allege where Allen discloses a light modulation device. Because the rejection has not alleged where all elements are disclosed by Allen, a prima facie case of anticipation has not been made.

While the Office Action alleges that Allen discloses light sources comprised of an "array of lights" (citing paragraph [0045]), the Office Action is incorrect.

Paragraph [0045] only discloses that while three light sources 124, 126, and 128 are disclosed, additional light sources can be added such as light sources for white, cyan, yellow, and magenta. Paragraph [0045] is silent as to any single light source being made of multiple lights. Allen discloses that the additional lights contemplated in paragraph [0045] can correspond to any of the light sources 124, 126, and 128, or to "an array of sources." Thus, at

best, Allen appears to disclose that an array of sources can be created by adding the new lights, not that any particular light source is itself an array of lights.

However, even if Allen is deemed to disclose that a single light source 124, 126, or 128 can be an "array of lights", Allen does not disclose that any single light source has different light emitting devices each having a different emission spectra as claimed.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Jonathan H. Backenstose  
Registration No. 47,399

JAO:JHB/ccs

Date: April 4, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE  
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension  
necessary for entry;  
Charge any fee due to our  
Deposit Account No. 15-0461